

Remarks

Claims 1-20 are pending, and claims 1-20 stand rejected. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection set forth by the Examiner.

35 USC § 102 Rejection

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5, 7-11, and 14-18 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,717,830 (Sigler). The Applicants reiterate the arguments provided in the prior response, and ask the Examiner to kindly refer to the arguments in the prior response. The Applicants also put forth the additional arguments below.

The Examiner has reiterated that Sigler teaches a base station system that “responsive to receiving call signaling from a mobile wireless device, determines if the call signaling is for a low latency service, forwards the call signaling over the special connection on the bearer network if the call signaling is for a low latency service, and forwards the call signaling over the signaling network if the call signaling is not for a low latency service”. The Applicants again argue that Sigler does not teach a base station system as recited in claim 1.

In rejecting a base station system, the Examiner cited to the Network Communication Controller (NCC) in Sigler. A base station system is understood to be a system that exchanges traffic with a mobile device over the air interface, and exchanges traffic with a switching system over a transport network (sometimes referred to as a backhaul network). The NCC in Sigler does not perform such a function. The NCC in Sigler controls the allocation of communication channels, but is not the interface between a mobile device and the rest of the network. Therefore, the Applicants cannot understand how the Examiner can cite to the NCC in Sigler to reject the base station system of claim 1. The Applicants made this argument in the last response. In this Office action on pages 5-6, the Examiner has failed to address these comments by the Applicants. It appears by the Examiner’s remarks that he/she has not considered the language of “base station system” in claim 1. The Applicants respectfully ask the Examiner to clearly explain how an NCC in a satellite network teaches a base station system.

Also, the Examiner cites to column 16-17, lines 61-6 in Sigler in rejecting the limitation of “determines if the call signaling is for a low latency service”. The Applicants will traverse this section of Sigler in detail to show that no determination is made as recited in claim 1. This

section in Sigler first states that “A mobile user requests a channel on a Push-To-Talk (PTT) basis. The MET receives an assignment of demand period satellite resources consisting of an outbound channel frequency and an inbound channel frequency relevant to the particular NET ID (per defined CUG beam). The mobile user is alerted by a tone when the channel is available and the base FES manages the contention on the communications channel.” The Applicants read this part of Sigler to merely state that for a PTT call, the MET receives transmit and receive channel frequencies for the PTT call. When the channel is available, a tone is transmitted to the mobile user, and the FES manages contention on the channel. The Applicants do not interpret any part of this section as stating that a base station system “determines if the call signaling is for a low latency service”. There is no mention of receiving call signaling, or processing the received call signaling to determine if it is for a low latency service.

The cited section of Sigler goes on to state that “Since the base FES retransmits the signal received from the mobile, the MET operates in a half duplex PTT mode, turning off the speaker while the microphone is engaged.” This sentence merely describes how the MET operates. It does not describe receiving call signaling, or processing the received call signaling to determine if it is for a low latency service.

The cited section of Sigler goes on to state that “When the user releases the PTT, the MET ceases transmission. On receipt of a release message from the base FES, the MET retunes to the signaling channel.” These two sentences merely state that the PTT call ends, and upon the session ending (indicated by the release message from the FES), the MET listens to a signaling channel. It does not describe receiving call signaling, or processing the received call signaling to determine if it is for a low latency service.

The Applicants thus again ask the Examiner how this section of Sigler teaches a base station system that “determines if the call signaling is for a low latency service”? A base station system is not described in this section or in Sigler generally. This section of Sigler does not mention receiving call signaling from a mobile device. There is no determination explicitly made in this section of Sigler, nor is there any implicit determination made as to whether received call signaling is for a low latency service. The Applicants do not find the relevance at all of this section of Sigler. The Applicants have also reviewed the remainder of Sigler and do not find any reference to a base station system generally or to a base station system that “determines if the call signaling is for a low latency service” as recited in claim 1.

The Applicants want to take this opportunity to remind the Examiner of the high standard of anticipation for a 35 USC 102 rejection. For anticipation, a cited reference must teach each and every limitation of the claims. So far, the Examiner has failed to show where Sigler teaches or reasonably suggests a base station system as recited in claim 1.

In further rejecting the base station system of claim 1, the Examiner cites to FIG. 28, and column 19, lines 33-36 and 41-46 in Sigler in rejecting the limitations of “forwards the call signaling over the special connection on the bearer network if the call signaling is for a low latency service, and forwards the call signaling over the signaling network if the call signaling is not for a low latency service”. In these limitations of claim 1, the base station system is forwarding call signaling to a switching system. If the call signaling is for a low latency service, then the base station system forwards the call signaling over the bearer network. If the call signaling is not for a low latency service, then the base station system forwards the call signaling over the signaling network. In the cited FIGS and description of Sigler, any communication is between a MET and an FES. Thus, the Applicants do not understand how these communications are relevant, as no base station system is discussed. Also, the communications described in FIG. 28 of Sigler are all for a low latency service. In FIG. 28 as cited by the Examiner, the out of bound signaling is for assigning the channel for the PTT call, and the inbound signaling is for accessing the inbound channel for the PTT call. Thus, there is no different treatment of call signaling based on whether the call signaling is for a low latency service or not.

On page 6 of the Office action, the Examiner states that “Sigler teaches a system that determines that a PTT service is being requested, and then a PTT_SU is used to request to the inbound signaling channel (reads on special connection), otherwise out of band signaling is used as shown in FIG. 28”. The Applicants disagree. First of all, there is no system in Sigler that “determines that a PTT service is being requested”. The Applicants do not agree with the Examiner that a determination is made merely because a PTT call is placed. In claim 1, an active determination is made, responsive to receiving call signaling, as to whether the call signaling is for a low latency service or not. There is no active determination such as this in Sigler. The Applicants find it completely unfair that the Examiner can infer that an active determination is made by a system in Sigler merely because a PTT call is placed. Secondly, the Examiner's statement that the PTT-SU is inbound signaling while other out of band signaling is used in FIG. 28, is not relevant to claim 1. The Examiner seems to think that if out of band signaling is used

and inbound signaling is used, then the base station system of claim 1 is taught. That is an incorrect assumption. The base station system in claim 1 transmits the call signaling over the bearer network if the call signaling is for a low latency service. The base station system in claim 1 transmits the call signaling over the signaling network if the call signaling is not for a low latency service. Thus, the Examiner should be showing where Sigler describes transmitting inbound or out of bound signaling based on whether the call signaling is for a low latency service. In FIG. 28 of Sigler, all of the signaling messages are for a PTT call. Thus, call signaling for a PTT call is transmitted inbound and out of bound in FIG. 28. The Applicants submit that Sigler cannot teach the functionality of a base station system as recited in claim 1, because PTT call signaling is transmitted both inbound and out of bound. There is no distinguishing between transmitting call signaling over a bearer network or a signaling network based on the whether the call signaling is for a low latency service or not.

The Applicants challenge the Examiner to clearly show where a base station system in Sigler distinguishes between call signaling for a low latency service and call signaling that is not for a low latency service, and then transmitting the call signaling over a signaling network or a bearer network based on the type of call signaling. Sigler does not teach or reasonably suggest this type of functionality. Thus, the Applicants respectfully ask the Examiner to either allow the pending claims, or to issue a new Office action either citing a new reference or clearly describing how Sigler teaches each and every limitation of the pending claims.

35 USC § 103 Rejection

The Examiner has rejected claims 6, 12-13, and 19-20 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Sigler and U.S. Patent publication 2002/0118665 (Cleveland). The Applicants submit that claims 6, 12-13, and 19-20 are non-obvious for at least the reasons provided above.

Conclusion

The Applicants submit that the pending claims are novel and non-obvious for at least the reasons provided above. The Applicants thus respectfully ask the Examiner to allow claims 1-20.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7-29-2008

/BRETT BORNSEN/

SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Brett L. Bornsen, Reg. No. 46,566

Duft Bornsen & Fishman, LLP

Telephone: (303) 786-7687

Facsimile: (303) 786-7691

Customer Number: 50525